DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 920 CG 016 322

AUTHOR Drummond, Robert J.
TITLE Reality Therapy and the Perceptions of the Staff and Residents of the Maine Youth Center Environment.
SPONS AGENCY Maine Univ., Orono. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 45p.; For related document, see CG 016 350.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; Attitude Change; *Correctional Institutions; Counseling Effectiveness; *Counseling Techniques; Counselor Client Relationship; Evaluation Criteria; Organizational Climate; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Maine Youth Center; *Reality Therapy

ABSTRACT

Reality Therapy was adopted as the major treatment modality to be used by the staff to work with the youth at the Maine Youth Center (MYC). A time-series design, which included the administration of the Correctional Institutions Environment Scale, was used to evaluate the influence of Reality Therapy on the perceptions of staff and youth at the center, and assess program changes over time (1980-1982). Results showed a changing emphasis in the program and treatment philosophy at the MYC. There appeared to be a greater emphasis on the relationship dimension which was reflected in the greater perceived involvement of youth in the program, the greater support perceived by youth from youth and staff, and the greater openness perceived in the system. Treatment was perceived as having a more practical orientation emphasis on reality, rather than on personal problem orientation. Emphasis appeared to be on the "now" rather than on what transpired before in the center. Numerous tables are provided to illustrate the comparative results. (Author/JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223920

REALITY THERAPY AND THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE STAFF AND RESIDENTS OF THE MAINE YOUTH CENTER ENVIRONMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert J. Drummond
UMO Teacher Corps Project

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Robert J. Drummond
Evaluator
University of Maine
Teacher Corps Project

University of North Florida
Jacksonville, Florida

CG 016322

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	1
Method	1
Staff Perceptions of the Correctional Environment Overtime	3
Comparison of Youth and Staff Perceptions	5
Within Staff Comparisons	9
Youth Perceptions of the Correctional Environment Overtime	10
Conclusions	11
Summary	12
Recommendations	13
Data	15-25
Appendix A	
Appendix B	

PREFACE

The purpose of this report is to explore the influence of Reality Therapy on the perceptions of staff and youth of the Maine Youth Center. Reality Therapy (Glasser, 1965) was adopted as the major treatment modality to be used by the staff to work with the youth at the Maine Youth Center. The Teacher Corps project on youth advocacy in the fourth and now last year of funding provided support for the training of staff and the evaluation of the program objectives set by the center. A time series design was utilized to evaluate the project. This report focuses on the January 1982 survey of staff and youth concerning their perceptions of the correctional environment.

The purpose of this report is to compare the resident and staff perceptions of the environment at the Maine Youth Center and to assess program changes over time as well as to contrast different units with each other. The report will be in five parts. In the first section, the perceptions of the total staff are compared over three different time periods. In the second section the perceptions of youth are contrasted with the perceptions of the staff. In the third section, the perceptions of the staff on the January 1982 testing are compared by unit. The fourth section presents a comparison of the youth over time. The last section includes conclusions and recommendations.

METHOD

A time series design was utilized to collect perceptions of the different populations over time and at specified points in time. The total resident population of youth was assessed at various time intervals. A random sample of staff was assessed at various time intervals, except during the January 1982 testing. The whole staff were asked to respond to the survey at this time period.

The Correctional Institutions Environment Scale (Moos, 1974) was part of the survey packet which staff and youth were asked to complete. The Correctional Institution Environment Scale (CIES) consists of nine subscales. Three of the scales measure relationship dimensions. These are Involvement, Support, and Expressiveness. Involvement scale measures how active and energetic the youth are in the day-to-day functioning of the program. Support scale measures the extent to which residents are encouraged to be

helpful and supportive toward other residents and how supportive the staff is towards residents. Expressiveness scale measures the extent to which the program encourages the open expression of feeling.

There are three Treatment program dimensions: Autonomy, Practical Orientation, and Personal Problem Orientation. The Autonomy scale assesses the extent to which residents are encouraged to take initiative in planning activities and take leadership in the unit. The Practical Orientation scale assesses the extent to which the resident's environment orients him towards preparing himself for release from the program. The Personal Problem Orientation scale assesses the extent to which youth are encouraged to be concerned with their personal problems and feelings and to seek to understand them.

There are also three scales measuring system maintenance dimensions, Order and Organization, Clarity, and Staff Control. The Order and Organization scale looks at how important order and organization is in the program to the youth. The Clarity scale measures the extent to which youth know what to expect in the day-to-day routine of the program. The Staff control scale investigates the perception of youth and staff of the measures used to keep youth under necessary control.

The thirty-six item short form of the CIES was used which included just four items from each of the nine subscales. The mean internal consistency reliability coefficient reported by the author for residents taking the test was .66 and for staff .71. The test-retest coefficients for residents ranged from .65 for Support

to .80 for Autonomy and Order and Organization.

The staff completed the CIES during the summer of 1980 when the program was being implemented, also during the Spring of 1981 when the program was underway and during January of 1982 after the program had been implemented for a period of about three years. The youth were assessed at the same time during the latter two time periods and separately previous to those periods.

STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF THE CORRECTIONAL ENVIRONMENT OVER TIME

The perceptions of the correctional environment by the staff from 1980 to 1982 are presented in Table 1. There is a marked change in the perceptions of the staff of the relationship dimension. The staff perception of the involvement of youth is much more positive in 1982 than in 1980. The youth are perceived as being more proud of the MYC, more motivated to really try to get better, more concerned about each other and as having more group spirit.

Perceived support by the staff and youth is greater in 1982 than in 1980. Youth are perceived to be more concerned in helping take care of their peers. Staff is perceived as helpful in getting youth to know each other better.

There are changes also over time on the Treatment program dimension. This is especially true in practical orientation areas. The staff perceives that youth are encouraged to plan more for the future now than in 1980 as well as encouraged to learn new ways of doing things. There has been more emphasis on what youth will be doing when they leave.

There is somewhat a decrease in the staff's perception of the personal problem orientation. There is a slight decrease from 80 to 82 in the percent of staff who checked true to the state-

ment that personal problems are openly talked about and that discussions emphasize the understanding of personal problems.

There were also differences on the system maintenance dimensions. On the Order scale there is an increase on the percentage of staff who perceive that the MYC is a well organized unit. Forty eight percent said true in 1980 while 62 percent said true in 1982. Neatness of the unit has shown a slight decline. There were differences on staff control items. Few youth are perceived criticizing staff to their face now than in 1980. The staff is perceived as being more in control, making more decisions than previously. Youth are not seen as being transferred as much as they were previously when they break rules.

There seems to be greater clarity. There is more orientation of youth given so that they know what to expect now than before. There is less argument among the staff than before.

There are some changes in Expressiveness. Fewer youth now are perceived as tending to hide their feelings from the staff. There is a tendency for more openness.

There is a tendency for less autonomy on the part of the youth. Overall the percentages of autonomy items hover around fifty percent indicating that there autonomy is more situational specific. Youth are perceived by staff as having more responsibility for their behavior and program than previously.

There were four items which received seventy-six percent agreement or higher over the three time periods. These were:

a. The staff sometimes argue (Clarity)

b. The staff makes sure unit is always neat (Order)

c. Staff help youth get acquainted (Support)

d. Youth encouraged to learn new ways of doing things (Practical Orientation)

There wer four items receiving less than twenty-four percent agreement over the three assessment periods:

a. Staff has little time to encourage youth (Support)

b. Little emphasis on making plans to get out (Practical Orientation)

c. Youth rarely talk about personal problems with peers (Personal Problem Orientation)

d. Day room is often messy (Order)

COMPARISON OF YOUTH AND STAFF PERCEPTIONS

The comparison of the perceptions of the youth and staff of the correctional environment during January of 1982 is reported in Table 2. There were four items in which both groups agreed to by seventy-six or more percent. They were:

a. Staff makes sure unit is always neat (Order)

b. Youth encouraged to plan for future (Practical Orientation)

c. Youth encouraged to learn new ways of doing things (Practical Orientation)

d. New youth given orientation (Clarity)

It should be noted that in each class the youth were more positive about their perceptions than the staff i.e. a greater percent of youth checked true than staff.

There were two items which less than twenty-five percent of both groups chekced true. These were:

a. Staff have little time to encourage youth (Support)

b. Staff gives youth little responsibility (Autonomy)

There were fourteen items on which the perceptions of the staff and youth varied ten percent or more. The greatest discrepancy was on an Order scale item, the unit usually looks a little messy. Thirty percent of staff checked true as compared with 62 percent of the youth. The second item found a difference of 24 percent. Seventy-six percent of the staff checked true to the item staff sometimes argue with each other. Only 52 percent of youth checked Yes. The third item was checked true by 86 percent of the youth as compared with 63 percent of the staff. The item was once a schedule is arranged, youth must follow it (Staff Control). There was a difference of sixteen percent on the item the staff is always changing their minds (Clarity). Thirty percent of the staff checked true as compared to 46 percent of the youth. Two items had a fifteen percent difference in how the two groups responded. Thirty-four percent of the youth thought the day room was often messy (Order) as compared to 19 percent of the staff. Sixty-five percent of the staff felt personal problems were openly talked about as compared to 50 percent of the youth (Personal Problem Orientation). Another Personal Problem item youth rarely talk about personal problems with their peers was also viewed differently by the two groups. Thirty-six percent of the youth checked true as compared to 22 percent of the staff.

Sixty-two percent of the residents felt that youth were transferred from the unit if the rules were not obeyed as compared to 49 percent of the staff. Four items had a twelve percent difference in how the groups responded. More youth than staff

felt that staff were interested in following up youth once they left (62% to 50%). The other items which were checked more by youth than staff were that residents tend to hid their feelings from staff (78% to 66%), that youth were expected to show leadership (85% to 73%). Eighty-six percent of the staff checked that staff help new youth get acquainted while 74 percent of the residents felt that way.

More youth than staff felt that youth really try to improve (74% to 64%) although youth felt there was less group spirit than did the staff. Both items belong to the Involvement Scale.

In general there were more differences in the system maintenance dimension. There were differences in perception on the four Order and Organization items. They measure how important order and organization is in the program. There were two items from the Clarity scale.

There were three items with discrepancies in perception of staff and residents from the Personal Problem Orientation Scale and one from the Autonomy scale. These two scales represent treatment program dimensions. Over all residents feel they are not encouraged or understood as much as they could be in relation to their personal problems.

There were differences on two items from the Involvement as well as the Support scales. These measure the relationship dimension.

The second major type of comparison made between staff and youth was comparing the perceptions of the staff from specific cottages with the perceptions of the residents. It should be noted that although all the youth responded from each cottage,

not all the cottage staff responded. The number of staff responding per unit varies from two to seven. The results of these comparisons should be cautiously interpreted. The comparison of these perceptions is reported in Table 3. The Security Unit and Cottage 1 had the highest consensus between staff and residents perceptions but still had marked discrepancies on about a third of the items. There were six items in which there was complete consensus for the STU Unit, Cottage 1, and Cottage 9, i.e. The same percent of both groups checked the item true.

In general, there is not a consistent pattern of items that are perceived the same by both groups. Practical Orientation, Expressiveness, Clarity, and Support items were among the type of items which both groups had the same proportion of true responses checked.

The comparison of the perceptions of youth and staff on the CIES the spring of 1981 is included in Appendix A. Table 19 from the Spring 1981 report is reproduced for convenience of the reader. There were six items in which 75 percent of both groups checked true. These items were:

Facilities are always neat (Order)

Residents are encouraged to take leadership (Autonomy)

Youth encouraged to learn new ways of doing things (Practical Orientation)

Youth explained how center works (Clarity)

Staff tells youth when they are doing well (Clarity)

Youth are careful of what they say (Expressiveness)

There were four items in which less than 25 percent of both groups checked true. These items were:

Little emphasis on youth making plans for getting out (Practical Orientation)

Staff gives youth little responsiblity (Autonomy)

Youth can say anything to counselors (Expressiveness)

Youth rarely punished (Staff Control)

It is interesting to note that four items relate to the system maintenance dimension, four to the treatment program dimension and two to the relationship dimension.

In looking at discrepancies between the proportion of groups checking true to an item, on the first thirty-six items there are 23 items which staff and youth vary by ten percent or more. There are fewest discrepancies in the items relating to relationship dimensions such as involvement and expressiveness. In the treatment dimension more differences were found in the Practical Orientation and Problem Orientation items than in the Autonomy items. In the system maintenance dimension there were more discrepancies in how both groups perceived order and organization and clarity items than staff control items.

WITHIN STAFF COMPARISONS

The comparison of the responses to the CIES by staff classification is given in Table 4. There were 131 staff who responded to the scale. These individuals were classified into eleven job categories. Some groups were represented by only three or four staff members while others had larger numbers. The table presents the number of each group who checked true to the statement on the CIES.

Inspection of items across group will give indications of the tremendous variability of perceptions across groups. The greatest consensus appears to be on the Practical Orientation items such as youth are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things and youth are encouraged to plan for the future and Clarity items such as when residents first arrive on the unit, someone shows them around and explains how the unit operates.

In comparing groups providing direct services to the youth such as the teachers and cottage staff, there are very few items on which the groups show any consistency of perception of the items. There are similar differences between the cottage staff and night staff and the spare staff and cottage staff.

YOUTH PERCEPTIONS OF THE CORRECTIONAL ENVIRONMENT OVER TIME

The perceptions of the youth of their environment from 1980 to 1982 is reported in Table 11 which can be found in Appendix B of the report. The youth have responded five times to the CIES from March 1980 to January of 1982. The information is presented in the report of the fourth Assessment of Youth (Drummond, 1982). In comparing the baseline information collected in March 1980 with the latest assessment in January 1982, just identifying the items minus 10 percent agreement in the groups there are three items which show a positive incrase of 10 percent or more and there are five items which show a negative change of 10 percent or more.

The three positive items are:

Staff interested in follow-up of youth (46%-62%) (Support)

Youth are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things (83%-93%) (Practical Orientation)

Center usually looks messy (48%-62%) (Order)

There are five items which show a decline in the percent of individuals who checked true. These are:

Staff have very little time to encourage residents (32%-21%) (Support)

Youth rarely talk about their personal problems (53%-36%) (Personal Problem Orientation)

Staff gives yout little responsibility (33%-17%) (Autonomy)

Little emphasis placed on what youth do after they leave unit (49%-32%) (Practical Orientation)

MYC is a well organized unit (66%-55%) (Clarity)

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Staff perceptions of the involvement of the youth is much more positive in 1982 than in 1980. The youth are perceived as being more proud, more motivated to really try to get better, more concerned about each other in 1982 than in 1980.
2. Staff perceives more emphasis has been placed on practical orientation in 1982 than in 1980.
3. Staff has become more interested in interpersonal dimensions than in neatness of the units and center over time.
4. The staff perceives a greater openness both by staff and youth than before.
5. There is current consensus of staff and youth on practical orientation aspects of the program and certain aspects of clarity and order and organization.

6. There were more discrepancies between staff and youth on the system maintenance dimensions than on the treatment or relationship dimensions.

7. Youth feel they are not understood or encouraged to be concerned with their personal problems as much as they probably would like to be.

8. Cottage staff-youth comparisons show marked discrepancies. The results have to be cautiously interpreted because in many units only a few of the staff responded.

9. The range of the discrepancies between youth and staff perceptions of the environment is less in 1982 than in 1981. There is more consensus of opinion.

10. There is tremendous variability of the perceptions of the environment by job category of staff. For example, the perception of groups providing direct services such as teachers and cottage staff vary considerably. The differences need to be cautiously interpreted because some groups have low numbers represented. The greatest consensus appears to be on the practical orientation and clarity items.

SUMMARY

The perceptions of the youth as well as staff over time reflect a changing emphasis in the program and treatment philosophy of the MYC. There appears to be greater emphasis on the relationship dimension which is reflected in the greater perceived involvement of the youth in the program, the greater support perceived by youth from youth and staff and the more openness perceived in the system.

Treatment is perceived as having a more practical orientation emphasis on reality, than on personal problem orientation. Emphasis appears to be more on the "now" than on what transpired before.

There appears to be more responsibility demanded of the youth and more structure provided by the staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Discrepancies in perceptions related to clarity and order and organization represent problems in communication. Communication skills and receptive communication skills need to be a part of both staff continuing education programs as well as included in the education program for the youth. Youth need to be taught listening skills. Staff need to know how to be good listeners also.

2. Messages, rules, memos, etc. need to be reviewed and evaluated. Factors such as simplicity, readability, clarity, etc. need to be taken into consideration when evaluating information to be communicated.

3. Inservice sessions need to be made available for new personnel so that they are acquainted with the philosophy, policies and practices of the center.

4. Modeling of behavior by staff is essential for behavior change of youth. Discrepancies of behavior and policies carried out by different personnel or units probably have an adverse effect on treatment. Personnel need to be trained to improve their evaluation skills as well as their observational skills.

5. Staff expectancy or the Pigmalyon effect probably can have an adverse as well as positive effect in the interpersonal relationships between staff and youth. Staff need to be trained to understand their biases and to develop their interpersonal communication skills.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF
THE CORRECTIONAL ENVIRONMENT 1980-1982

ITEM	TIME SUMMER 1980 (Percent who checked TRUE)	SPRING 1981	WINTER 1982
MYC residents proud of this unit	28	31	48
Staff have little time to encourage youth	16	21	18
Youth encouraged to show their feelings	71	74	72
Staff act on youth's suggestions	57	44	52
Little emphasis on making plans to get out	17	13	16
Youth expected to share personal problems with each other	62	63	62
Staff make sure that unit is always neat	83	76	79
Staff sometimes argue with each other	85	81	76
Once schedule arranged youth must follow it	64	70	63
Youth really try to improve and get better	50	61	64
Staff interested in following up youth after they leave	62	59	50
Youth tend to hide feelings from staff	72	69	66
Youth expected to take leadership in this unit	86	86	73
Youth encouraged to plan for future	55	70	83
Youth rarely talk about personal problems with peers	19	23	22
Day room often messy	10	14	19
If youth's program changed, staff explains reason	88	86	71
Youth criticize staff to their face	43	37	37
Youth on this unit care about each other	48	46	55
Staff help new youth get acquainted	83	84	86

STAFF PERCEPTIONS CONTINUED

ITEM	TIME SUMMER 1980 (Percent	SPRING 1981 who	WINTER 1982 checked TRUE)
Staff and youth say how they feel about each other	50	56	46
Staff give youth very little responsibility	17	13	25
Youth encouraged to learn new ways of doing things	88	82	89
Personal problems openly talked about	71	63	65
Unit usually looks a little messy	10	17	30
New youth given orientation	74	79	89
Youth transferred from a unit if rules not obeyed	55	57	49
Little group spirit at MYC	33	36	30
More mature youth will take care of less mature	48	51	66
People say what they really think around here	43	41	49
Youth have say in what goes on here	57	59	47
Little emphasis on what youth will do when they leave	28	23	39
Discussions emphasize understanding of personal problems	81	71	69
MYC is well organized unit	48	38	62
Staff always changing their minds	28	33	30
All decisions in unit made by staff not youth	33	43	54

TABLE 2

STAFF YOUTH COMPARISON
ON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION ENVIRONMENT SCALE
JANUARY 1982

ITEM	STAFF (131) PERCENT TRUE	YOUTH (229) PERCENT TRUE
Youth proud of MYC	48	55
Staff have little time to encourage youth	18	21
Youth encouraged to show their feelings	72	77
Staff act on youth's suggestions	52	55
Little emphasis on making plans for release	16	27
Youth expected to share personal problems	62	62
Staff make sure that unit is always neat	79	86
Staff sometimes argue with each other	76	52
Once schedule is arranged youth must follow it	63	86
Youth really try to improve	64	74
Staff interested in following up youth once they leave	50	62
Youth tend to hide feelings from staff	66	78
Youth expected to take leadership	73	85
Youth encouraged to plan for future	83	92
Youth rarely talk about personal problems with peers	22	36
Day room often messy	19	34
If youth's program changed, staff explains reason	71	70
Youth criticize staff to face	37	48
Youth care about each other	55	64
Staff help new youth get acquainted	86	74
Staff and youth say how they feel about each other	46	58
Staff give youth very little responsibility	25	17

STAFF YOUTH COMPARISON CONTINUED

ITEM	STAFF (131) PERCENT TRUE	YOUTH (229) PERCENT TRUE
Youth encouraged to learn new ways of doing things	89	93
Personal problems openly talked about	65	50
Unit usually looks a little messy	30	62
New youth given orientation	89	92
Youth transferred from unit if rules not obeyed	49	62
Little group spirit at MYC	30	40
More mature youth will take care of less mature	66	70
People say what they really think around here	49	56
Youth have say what goes on here	47	44
Little emphasis on what youth will do when they leave	39	32
Discussions emphasize understanding of personal problems	69	70
MYC is well organized	62	56
Staff always changing their minds	30	46
All decisions in unit made by staff not youth	54	60

TABLE 3

STAFF/RESIDENTS PERCEPTIONS OF
THE CORRECTION ENVIRONMENT

ITEM	STU		1		2		6		7		9		H	
	S (4)	Y (12)	S (5)	Y (32)	S (2)	Y (9)	S (3)	Y (32)	S (7)	Y (23)	S (3)	Y (12)	S (8)	Y (13)
MYC residents proud of unit	100	50	80	56	50	89	67	56	14	91	33	33	63	31
Staff have little time to encourage youth	00	17	20	19	00	11	00	31	43	13	67	25	25	23
Youth encouraged to show their feelings	100	100	80	75	100	67	100	75	86	78	67	67	88	69
Staff act on youth's suggestions	75	17	80	38	50	78	33	47	14	87	67	75	75	46
Little emphasis on making plans to get out	00	25	00	28	00	22	00	44	29	17	33	75	00	23
Youth expected to share personal problems	100	75	100	59	50	22	100	69	29	52	33	42	75	62
Staff make sure that unit is always neat	50	83	100	89	100	100	67	84	71	87	67	75	100	85
Staff sometimes argue with each other	25	58	40	22	50	22	100	47	100	52	100	92	75	46
Once schedule arranged youth must follow it	75	92	80	81	100	67	100	91	57	91	00	58	75	77
Youth really try to improve and get better	100	58	80	72	100	89	33	81	71	74	67	75	63	69
Staff interested in following up youth after they leave	75	83	80	69	100	78	00	47	43	61	33	83	100	62

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

	STU		1		2		6		7		9		H	
	S	Y	S	Y	S	Y	S	Y	S	Y	S	Y	S	Y
Youth tend to hide feelings from staff	75	75	40	81	100	78	100	81	71	78	33	75	00	69
Youth expected to take leadership in this unit	100	83	100	100	50	67	67	72	86	83	67	92	88	62
Youth encouraged to plan for future	75	92	100	100	50	89	100	84	86	74	100	100	100	85
Youth rarely talk about personal problems with peers	00	42	00	28	00	33	00	44	43	35	00	17	13	77
Day Room often messy	50	25	20	13	00	11	33	38	14	17	00	75	00	62
If youth's program changed, staff explains reason	100	75	100	75	100	67	67	72	86	78	67	75	88	62
Youth criticize staff to their face	25	67	60	44	50	33	100	69	29	35	00	75	63	46
Youth on this unit care about each other	100	67	80	78	50	78	100	59	57	74	100	50	75	31
Staff help new youth get acquainted	75	75	100	75	100	78	100	84	71	83	100	92	100	77
Staff/youth open about each other	100	42	80	63	100	89	100	69	57	49	67	67	50	46
Staff give youth little responsibility	25	42	00	00	50	11	00	16	15	26	00	17	25	23
Youth encouraged to learn new ways of doing things	100	100	100	97	100	89	100	94	71	91	100	92	100	77

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

	STU		1		2		6		7		9		H	
	S	Y	S	Y	S	Y	S	Y	S	Y	S	Y	S	Y
Personal problems openly talked about	100	75	80	53	100	22	100	59	86	57	100	50	75	54
Unit usually looks messy	25	33	00	47	50	78	33	63	43	39	67	92	25	69
New youth given orientation	75	100	100	97	100	100	100	94	86	87	100	83	100	85
Youth transferred if disobey	50	67	40	38	00	100	33	53	71	91	00	83	25	62
Little group spirit at MYC	25	50	00	22	00	33	00	44	29	22	67	92	25	62
More mature take care of less	100	67	80	84	100	67	67	81	86	83	100	42	63	54
People say what they think	50	50	80	47	100	78	67	56	43	57	67	83	63	69
Youth have say in what happens	75	17	40	34	50	55	67	72	57	57	33	25	88	38
Little emphasis on what youth will do when they leave	00	50	00	25	00	11	67	38	43	39	67	50	00	46
Discussions show understanding	50	83	100	75	100	89	100	78	43	70	67	67	88	69
MYC is well organized	75	75	100	75	50	44	67	69	71	87	33	8	63	46
Staff always changing mind	25	25	00	19	50	55	33	63	14	43	67	67	00	62
All decisions made by staff	75	83	40	63	100	44	33	63	57	57	00	67	25	54

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF CIES ITEMS
BY STAFF CLASSIFICATION
JANUARY 1982

ITEM	ADM	AFT	COT	CON	IUC	C/M	NS	POB	REC	SPA	TEA	TOT
MYC residents proud of unit	25	75	62	20	33	61	42	40	57	42	26	48
Staff have little time to encourage youth	00	25	24	40	00	22	00	10	14	25	11	18
Youth encouraged to show their feelings	50	100	92	60	67	56	75	50	86	83	47	72
Staff act on youth's suggestions	50	50	62	60	33	44	33	50	86	42	47	52
Little emphasis on making plans to get out	00	25	11	00	00	17	8	10	14	42	26	16
Youth expected to share personal problems	50	100	73	60	33	44	67	30	86	58	63	62
Staff make sure that unit is always neat	50	75	89	40	100	67	100	80	100	83	63	79
Staff sometimes argue with each other	100	75	73	100	100	67	42	90	86	83	79	76
Once schedule arranged youth must follow it	50	50	76	00	100	72	75	80	29	58	47	63
Youth really try to improve and get better	75	100	73	20	100	56	75	70	71	42	53	64
Staff interested in following up youth after they leave	50	25	70	20	33	56	33	50	43	33	42	50

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

ITEM	ADM	AFT	COT	CON	IUC	C/M	NS	POB	REC	SPA	TEA	TOT
Youth tend to hide feelings from staff	75	75	57	100	67	50	58	70	86	67	79	66
Youth expected to take leadership in this unit	50	100	89	80	00	44	42	80	71	92	79	73
Youth encouraged to plan for future	75	100	95	80	100	61	75	100	86	83	74	83
Youth rarely talk about personal problems with peers	25	50	14	20	33	17	25	50	29	25	16	22
Day Room often messy	25	00	22	80	00	28	00	20	00	25	11	19
If youth's program changed, staff explains reason	75	50	92	20	100	78	83	70	71	67	32	71
Youth criticize staff to their face	00	00	46	60	33	39	33	40	00	33	47	37
Youth on this unit care about each other	50	100	78	40	67	33	58	40	43	33	47	55
Staff help new youth get acquainted	75	100	97	80	67	78	92	80	100	83	74	86
Staff/youth open about each other	25	25	73	20	33	44	42	40	29	42	37	46
Staff give youth little responsibility	25	50	16	00	67	28	42	30	14	8	37	25
Youth encouraged to learn new ways of doing things	75	100	100	80	100	89	75	80	100	92	79	89

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

ITEM	ADM	AFT	COT	CON	IUC	C/M	NS	POB	REC	SPA	TEA	TOT
Personal problems openly talked about	50	100	89	20	100	56	67	60	29	50	53	65
Unit usually looks messy	50	50	32	40	00	33	33	40	29	42	11	30
New youth given orientation	50	100	100	80	100	78	92	90	100	92	74	89
Youth transferred if disobey	25	75	35	80	33	61	58	70	43	58	37	49
Little group spirit at MYC	25	25	22	60	67	28	50	40	14	17	32	30
More mature care for less	75	100	84	40	67	50	67	40	71	75	53	66
People say what they think	25	25	73	20	67	61	50	40	29	25	32	49
Youth have say in what happens	50	50	65	60	33	33	33	30	86	33	37	47
Little emphasis on what youth do after leaving	50	75	24	40	67	33	42	60	57	25	47	39
Discussions show understanding	75	75	84	80	100	56	75	60	86	58	47	69
MYC is well organized	50	100	76	40	100	56	67	40	86	50	42	62
Staff always changing mind	00	00	24	80	00	33	25	40	29	25	42	30
All decisions made by staff	25	50	51	40	100	44	50	80	29	67	63	54

HEADING CODE FOR TABLE 4

ADM	Administration
AFT	Aftercare
COT	Cottage
CON	Control
IUC	Intensive Care Unit
C/M	Custodial/Maintenance
NS	Night Staff
POB	Plant Operations and Business Services
REC	Recreation
SPA	Spare
TEA	Teachers
TOT	Total

APPENDIX A

TABLE 19
COMPARISON OF STAFF AND YOUTH PERCEPTIONS
OF THE CORRECTIONAL ENVIRONMENT SPRING 1981

			Group Staff	Youth	
1.	Residents are proud of MYC	T	31.4	62.4	y+
		F	58.6	35.8	
		M	10.0		
2.	Little time to encourage residents	T	21.4	31.8	
		F	71.4	68.2	
		M	7.1		
3.	Youth encouraged to show their feelings	T	74.3	68.2	
		F	18.6	31.2	
		M	7.1		
4.	Staff act on resident's suggestions	T	44.3	34.1	s+
		F	41.4	68.2	
		M	14.3		
5.	Little emphasis on youth making plans for getting out	T	12.9	23.1	
		F	80.0	76.3	
		M	7.1		
6.	Youth share personal problems with each other	T	62.9	60.7	
		F	27.1	39.3	
		M	10.0		
7.	Facilities are always neat	T	75.7	91.3	y+
		F	14.3	8.7	
		M	10.0		
8.	Staff sometimes argue with each other	T	81.4	56.1	s+
		F	11.4	43.9	
		M	7.1		
9.	Residents must follow schedule	T	70.0	85.0	y+
		F	22.9	15.0	
		M	7.1		
10.	Residents really try to improve	T	61.4	65.3	
		F	22.9	34.1	
		M	15.7		
11.	Staff interested in follow-up of youth	T	58.6	54.9	
		F	30.0	44.5	
		M	11.4		
12.	Youth hide feelings from the staff	T	68.6	77.5	y+
		F	20.0	22.5	
		M	11.4		

			Staff	Youth	
13.	Residents are encouraged to take leadership	T	85.7	79.8	s+
		F	5.7	20.2	
		M	8.6		
14.	Youth encouraged to plan future	T	70.0	93.1	y+
		F	21.4	6.9	
		M	8.6		
15.	Youth rarely talk about their personal problems	T	22.9	43.4	y+
		F	68.6	56.6	
		M	8.6		
16.	Day room is often messy	T	14.3	35.3	
		F	72.9	64.7	
		M	12.9		
17.	If program changed, youth told why	T	85.7	62.4	s+
		F	7.1	37.6	
		M	7.1		
18.	Youth may criticize staff members to face	T	37.1	31.8	
		F	52.9	68.2	
		M	10.0		
19.	Youth care about each other	T	45.7	43.4	
		F	38.6	55.5	
		M	15.7		
20.	Staff help youth get acquainted	T	84.3	74.0	s+
		F	5.7	25.4	
		M	10.0		
21.	Staff and youth tell how they feel about each other	T	55.7	45.7	s+
		F	31.4	53.2	
		M	12.9		
22.	Staff gives youth little responsibility	T	12.9	17.9	
		F	77.1	81.5	
		M	10.0		
23.	Youth encouraged to learn new ways of doing	T	82.9	93.6	y+
		F	8.6	6.4	
		M	8.6		
24.	Personal problems openly talked about	T	62.9	41.0	s+
		F	24.3	59.0	
		M	12.9		
25.	Center usually looks messy	T	17.1	55.5	y+
		F	71.4	44.5	
		M	11.4		

			Staff	Youth	
26.	Youth explained how Center works	T	78.6	95.4	y+
		F	10.0	4.6	
		M	11.4		
27.	Youth will be transferred if disobedient	T	57.1	53.2	
		F	32.9	46.8	
		M	10.0		
28.	Little group spirit at MYC	T	35.7	37.0	
		F	51.4	62.4	y+
		M	12.9		
29.	More mature youth take care of less	T	51.4	67.6	y+
		F	35.7	32.4	
		M	12.9		
30.	People say what they really think	T	41.4	39.3	
		F	47.1	60.7	y+
		M	11.4		
31.	Youth have a say about what goes on	T	58.6	20.8	s+
		F	30.0	78.6	
		M	11.4		
32.	Little emphasis on what youth do after	T	22.9	35.3	
		F	67.1	64.7	
		M	10.0		
33.	Discussions emphasize understanding persons	R	71.4	66.5	
		F	12.9	33.5	
		M	14.3		
34.	MYC well-organized unit	T	37.5	67.6	y+
		F	50.0	31.2	
		M	14.3		
35.	Staff are always changing minds	T	32.9	65.9	y+
		F	48.6	34.1	
		M	18.6		
36.	Decisions about Center made by staff	T	42.9	68.8	y+
		F	44.3	31.2	
		M	12.9		
37.	Youth put a lot of energy in what they do	T	38.6	60.1	y+
		F	44.3	39.9	
		M	17.1		
38.	Youth rarely help each other	T	20.0	30.6	y+
		F	67.1	69.4	
		M	12.9		
39.	Youth say anything to counselors	T	14.3	10.4	
		F	72.9	89.6	y+
		M	12.9		

			Staff	Youth	
40.	Staff discourages criticism	T	38.6	50.9	y+
		F	48.6	48.6	
		M	12.9		
41.	Care more about feelings than personal	T	60.0	40.5	s+
		F	28.6	59.0	
		M	11.4		
42.	Staff interested in learning about feelings	T	34.3	43.9	y+
		F	55.7	55.5	
		M	10.0		
43.	Things disorganized around here	T	67.1	75.1	y+
		F	22.9	24.9	
		M	10.0		
44.	Staff tell youth when they are doing well	T	81.4	84.4	
		F	7.1	15.6	
		M	11.4		
45.	Youth rarely punished	T	24.3	22.0	
		F	65.7	78.0	y+
		M	10.0		
46.	MYC has very little social activities	T	40.0	34.1	
		F	51.4	65.9	y+
		M	8.6		
47.	Staff go out of way to help youth	T	68.6	59.0	s+
		F	18.6	41.0	
		M	12.9		
48.	Youth careful what they say	T	77.1	93.1	y+
		F	14.3	6.9	
		M	8.6		
49.	Youth encouraged to start their own activities	T	64.3	68.8	
		F	22.9	31.2	
		M	12.9		
50.	MYC emphasizes job training	T	65.7	50.9	s+
		F	22.9	49	
		M	11.4		

APPENDIX B

TABLE 11

CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION ENVIRONMENT
SCALE COMPARISONS 1980 to 1982
YOUTH

ITEM		MAR 1980 (150)	MAY 1980 (180)	NOV 1980 (53)	MAY 1981 (173)	JAN 1982 (229)
Residents proud of youth center	T	47.9	63.1	64.2	62.4	55.0
	F	52.1	36.3	35.8	37.6	45.0
Little time to encourage residents	T	32.2	27.0	30.2	31.8	20.9
	F	67.8	73.0	69.8	68.2	79.1
Youth encouraged to show their feelings	T	69.1	77.1	62.3	68.2	76.9
	F	30.9	22.8	27.7	31.2	13.1
Staff act on resident's suggestions	T	50.3	59.2	50.9	31.1	54.6
	F	49.7	40.8	49.1	65.3	45.4
Little emphasis on youth making plans for getting out	T	32.9	23.5	17.0	23.1	27.1
	F	67.1	76.1	83.0	76.3	72.9
Youth share personal problems with each other	T	61.9	70.6	66.0	60.7	62.0
	F	38.1	18.9	34.0	39.3	38.0
Facilities are always neat	T	86.0	89.4	90.6	91.3	85.6
	F	14.0	10.6	9.4	8.7	14.4
Staff sometimes argue with each other	T	43.2	30.7	60.4	56.1	52.0
	F	56.8	69.3	39.6	43.9	48.0
Residents must follow schedule	T	91.8	84.8	90.6	85.0	85.6
	F	8.2	15.2	9.4	15.0	14.4
Residents really try to improve	T	72.7	74.7	56.6	65.3	74.2
	F	27.3	25.3	43.4	34.a	25.8
Staff interested in follow up of youth	T	45.8	60.0	50.9	54.9	62.0
	F	54.2	40.0	49.1	44.5	38.0
Youth hide feelings from the staff	T	79.7	63.7	83.0	77.5	78.2
	F	20.3	36.3	17.0	22.5	21.8
Residents are encouraged to take leadership	T	76.5	91.5	90.6	93.1	85.2
	F	23.5	8.5	9.4	6.9	14.8
Residents are encouraged to plan for future	T				93.1	92.1
	F				6.9	7.9

TABLE 11 CONTINUED

ITEM		MAR 1980	MAY 1980	NOV 1980	MAY 1981	JAN 1982
Youth rarely talk about their personal problems	T	52.7	35.0	54.7	43.4	35.8
	F	47.3	65.0	45.3	56.6	64.2
Day room is often messy	T	33.6	19.8	30.2	35.3	33.6
	F	66.4	80.2	69.8	64.7	66.4
If program changed, youth told why	T	72.7	76.8	67.9	62.4	70.0
	F	27.3	23.2	32.1	37.6	30.0
Youth may critize staff member to face	T	44.0	40.1	45.3	31.8	47.6
	F	56.0	59.9	54.7	68.2	52.4
Youth care about each other	T	59.7	68.4	62.3	43.4	64.2
	F	40.3	31.6	37.7	55.5	35.8
Staff help youth get acquainted	T	78.7	80.1	64.2	74.0	74.2
	F	21.3	19.9	35.8	25.4	25.8
Staff and youth tell how they feel about each other	T	50.3	60.7	50.9	45.7	57.6
	F	49.7	39.3	49.1	53.2	42.4
Staff gives youth little responsibility	T	33.3	23.0	30.2	17.9	16.6
	F	66.7	77.0	69.8	81.5	83.4
Encouraged to learn new ways of doing things	T	82.6	87.6	86.8	93.6	92.6
	F	17.4	12.4	13.2	6.4	7.4
Personal problems openly talked about	T	48.6	53.4	49.1	41.0	49.8
	F	51.4	46.6	50.9	59.0	50.2
Center usually looks messy	T	47.7	37.3	54.7	55.5	62.0
	F	52.3	62.7	45.3	44.5	38.0
Youth explained how Center works	T	90.0	89.9	98.1	95.4	91.7
	F	10.0	10.2	1.9	4.6	8.3
Youth will be transferred if disobedient	T	69.8	59.3	47.2	53.2	62.0
	F	30.2	40.7	52.8	46.8	38.0
Little group spirit at MYC	T	45.5	36.2	39.6	37.0	40.2
	F	54.1	63.8	60.4	62.4	59.8
More mature youth take care of less	T	71.8	74.6	66.0	67.6	70.3
	F	28.2	25.4	34.0	32.4	29.7

TABLE 11 CONTINUED

ITEM		MAR 1980	MAY 1980	NOV 1980	MAY 1981	JAN 1982
People say what they really think	T	62.6	61.6	58.5	39.3	56.3
	F	37.4	38.4	41.5	60.7	43.7
Youth have a say about what goes on	T	51.7	43.8	28.3	20.8	43.7
	F	48.3	56.1	71.7	78.6	56.3
Little emphasis on what youth do after	T	48.6	38.2	35.8	35.3	32.3
	F	51.4	61.8	64.2	64.7	67.7
Discussions emphasize understanding persons	T	61.6	59.6	58.5	66.5	70.3
	F	38.4	40.4	41.5	33.5	29.7
MYC well-organized unit	T	66.0	68.5	55.7	67.6	56.3
	F	34.0	31.5	45.3	31.2	43.7
Staff are always changing minds	T	42.1	52.8	28.3	65.9	45.9
	F	57.9	47.2	71.7	34.1	54.1
Decisions about Center made by staff	T	56.4	55.1	60.4	68.8	60.3
	F	43.6	44.9	39.6	31.2	39.7

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Drummond, R. J. Impact of Reality Therapy on the Maine Youth Center: Fourth Assessment of Youth. Orino, Me.: Teacher Corps Project, College of Education University of Maine, 1982.

Glasser, W. Reality Therapy. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Moos, R. H. Correctional Institutions Environment Scale. Palo Alto, Cal.: Consulting Psychological Press, 1974.